

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with 1, 5, and 11 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, and 11 are sought to be amended. Support for the amendment of these claims is found in the Specification at least at FIGs. 4 and 5, and p. 18, line 9 through p. 20, line 16. These changes introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The examiner has rejected claim 1, arguing that this claim is anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,623,600, to Ji, et al. ("Ji"). Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the virus screening device comprises a model of said second computer, the model configured to have a program contained in said computer data installed thereon, and wherein said model is further configured to be screened for said at least one virus. Ji does not disclose such a virus screening device. On the contrary, Ji discloses proxy servers that scan network traffic for viruses (Ji, Abstract). In Ji, a file that may contain a virus is stored and analyzed (Ji, col. 7, ln. 53-58). Ji does not disclose or suggest use of a model of a computer, where the model represents the computer to which the traffic is directed. Ji does not disclose or suggest installation of a program that is contained in the data, and

does not disclose or suggest screening of such a model for a virus. Ji therefore does not disclose or suggest all elements of claim 1 as amended. This reference therefore does not anticipate claim 1 as amended.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 2-4, arguing that these claims are anticipated by Ji. These claims depend from claim 1 as amended, and therefore contain all features thereof. As discussed above, claim 1 as amended includes features not disclosed or suggested by Ji. Each of claims 2-4 therefore likewise contains features not disclosed or suggested by Ji. Hence, none of claims 2-4 are anticipated by Ji.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 5, arguing that this claim is anticipated by Ji. Claim 5 has been amended to recite that said virus screening device comprises a model of said second computer, the model configured to have a program contained in said computer data installed thereon, and wherein said model is further configured to be screened for said at least one virus. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ji does not disclose or suggest such features. Ji therefore does not disclose or suggest all features of claim 5 as amended. For at least this reason, Ji does not anticipate claim 5 as amended.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 6-10, arguing that these claims are anticipated by Ji. These claims depend from claim 5 as amended, and therefore contain all features thereof. As discussed above, claim 5 as amended includes features not disclosed or suggested by Ji. Each of claims 6-10 therefore likewise contains features not disclosed or suggested by Ji. Hence none of claims 6-10 are anticipated by Ji.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 11, arguing that this claim is anticipated by Ji. Claim 11 has been amended to recite that said screening of data comprises creating a

model of the first computer, installing on the model a program contained in the data, and screening the model for the at least one virus. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ji does not disclose or suggest these features. Ji therefore fails to disclose or suggest all features of claim 11 as amended. Hence this claim is not anticipated by Ji.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 12-20, arguing that these claims are anticipated by Ji. These claims depend from claim 11 as amended, and therefore contain all features thereof. As discussed above, claim 11 as amended includes features not disclosed or suggested by Ji. Each of claims 12-20 therefore likewise contains features not disclosed or suggested by Ji. Hence, none of claims 12-20 are anticipated by Ji.

Other Matters

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-20 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting with respect to U.S. Patent 5,987,610. Applicant will appropriately address this double patenting rejection in the event that claims from the present application are found to be allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: Sept. 24, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

iM 724974